

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for withdrawing the final Office Action in response to Applicants' Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review filed August 29, 2007. Applicants amend claims 1, 16, 18, 29, 33, and 35. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-11, 13-20, 22, 24-31, 33-37, 39, and 41-48 remain pending and under examination.

In the Office Action,¹ the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7-11, 13-20, 22, 24-31, 33-37, 39, and 41-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,572,528 to Shuen ("Shuen") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,226,678 to Mattaway et al. ("Mattaway").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 7-11, 13-20, 22, 24-31, 33-37, 39, and 41-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shuen in view of Mattaway. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established at least because the differences between the prior art and Applicants' claims are such that it would not have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the prior art to arrive at Applicants' claimed invention.

Independent claim 1, for example, recites: "appending the security context information for the first process in a process table, the process table listing a first process identifier associated with the first process executing in memory" (emphasis added). Neither Shuen nor Mattaway teaches or suggests at least this element.

Shuens's alleged "process table" is "table 367 [in router 310] of information binding addresses of nodes 330 to its own address to render the nodes 300 accessible

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

through the router 310.” Shuen, 12:64-67; Office Action at 4. Mattaway’s alleged “process table” exists at a connection server, which “compares the E-mail address with the values of the records contained in on-line table 1516B” to identify a “one-to-one matching between E-mail addresses and Internet Protocol addresses.” Mattaway, 18:30-36; Office Action at 6. However, neither Shuen nor Mattaway discloses or suggests a process table “listing a first process identifier associated with the first process executing in memory,” as recited by claim 1 (emphasis added).

Further, the alleged process tables of both Shuen and Mattaway are stored in a “router 310” or “connection server,” respectively. Accordingly, neither Shuen nor Mattaway discloses “transmitting a packet from the first process [at the first node] to the second process through the open socket without passing through the administrative machine, the packet comprising the security context information for the first process in the process table,” as recited by claim 1 (emphasis added).

Because neither Shuen nor Mattaway, taken individually or in combination, teaches or suggests each and every element recited by claim 1, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established for claim 1. Independent claims 16, 18, 29, 33, and 35, although of different scope than claim 1, patentably distinguish from Shuen and Mattaway for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 2, 3, 5, 7-11, 13-15, 17, 19, 20, 22, 24-28, 30, 31, 34, 36, 37, 39, and 41-48 are allowable at least based on their respective dependence from allowable independent claims 1, 16, 18, 29, 33, or 35.

Moreover, claim 44 recites “an obtaining module for obtaining the security context information from a third process, the security context information comprising a virtual address and a node identification; and a limiting module for limiting each of the

first, second and third processes to communicate with another process provided that the communicating processes share the same node identification" (emphasis added).

Neither Shuen nor Mattaway teach or suggest at least this additional element.


Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: July 8, 2008

By: 
Nathan A. Sloan
Reg. No. 56,249
(404) 653-6464